



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/885,984	06/20/2001	David R. Daniels	P00,1904	6954
24573 7590 09/09/2008 BELL, BOYD & LLOYD, LLP P.O. Box 1135 CHICAGO, IL 60690				
EXAMINER				
SELF, SHELLEY M				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
3725				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
09/09/2008		PAPER		

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

# Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

09/885,984

**Applicant(s)**

DANIELS ET AL.

**Examiner**

Shelley Self

**Art Unit**

3725

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03 July 2008.  
2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.  
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 6, 11, 12, 15-20 and 22-34 is/are pending in the application.  
4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.  
6) ☒ Claim(s) 6, 11, 12, 15-20 and 22-34 is/are rejected.  
7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.  
8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  
10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 19 October 2007 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:  
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_  
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_  
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application  
6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Response to Amendment***

The amendment filed on October 19, 2007 has been considered but is ineffective to overcome the prior art reference and an action on the merits follows.

### ***Specification***

The amendment filed October 19, 2007 is objected to under 35 U.S.C. 132(a) because it introduces new matter into the disclosure. 35 U.S.C. 132(a) states that no amendment shall introduce new matter into the disclosure of the invention. The added material which is not supported by the original disclosure is as follows: *an adapter router mounting plate configured to be connected to the bottom side of the table top...the adapter router mounting plate defining: a mounting plate router bit hole; a first group of router mounting holes...and a second group of router mounting holes* (clms. 28, 33, 34).

Applicant is required to cancel the new matter in the reply to this Office Action.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 28, 33 and 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. Examiner notes neither the originally filed written disclosure nor the originally filed drawings provide support for *an adapter router mounting plate configured to be connected to the bottom side of the table top...the adapter router mounting plate defining: a mounting plate router bit hole; a first group of router mounting holes...and a second group of router mounting holes* as set forth in claim 28.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 6, 11, 12, 15, 16, 17, 19, 22, 23, 26 and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rice et al. (4,884,604) in view Pontikas (4,809,755). With regard to claims 6, 11, 12, 15, 22, 23 and 32, Rice discloses a router table comprising: a table top (16, 24) having a top side including a work surface (figs. 1, 3, 7,8 ) and a bottom side, the router table configured to mount a router (30) to the bottom side (fig. 8) of the table top the table top defining a router bit hole (fig. 4); a first and second group of holes (78) positioned adjacent to a router bit hole, wherein the router bit hole is positioned centrally with respect to a hole pattern and at least

one workpiece guide (46, 48; fig. 5) coupled to the top side; and a plurality of vertical legs (14). Rice does not disclose at least one of the distances of the first hole group being different from at least one of the distances of the second hole group. Rice does however teach the holes (78; fig. 5) of the first and second groups to be elongated so as to accommodate routers with differing mounting structures/footprints (fig. 5).

As to the recitation of a top side, Examiner notes the table portion (24) is able to be pivoted so as to be in the same plane as the table top (16) so as to create an elongated working surface, therefore (24) is a table top having a top side. Furthermore, the legs (14) are attached to the underside/bottom side of the table top via the leg supports (18).

Pontikas teaches that is old and well known in the mechanical arts to provide a table/mounting surface having multiple holes with differing distances from a router bit hole and unique angular positions around the router bit hole so as to accommodate mounting of different routers to the table (38; fig. 1). Because the references are from a similar art, and deal with a similar problem, i.e., mounting a router to an underside of a surface via holes it would have been obvious to the skilled artisan at the time of the invention to construct or replace Rice's holes (78) with holes having differing distances from the router bit hole so as to be able to mount different routers to a table top/mounting surface as taught by Pontikas.

With regard to claim 16, Rice discloses wherein the table top includes a work surface with a guide channel (38; fig. 1).

With regard to claims 17 and 24, Rice discloses a fence (44, 86) slidably positioned.

With regard to claims 19 and 26, Rice discloses a mitre guide (fig. 2).

Claims 18 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rice et al. (4,884,604) in view Pontikas (4,809,755) as applied to claims 6 and 11 above, and further in view of Atkins (4,603,612). Rick does not disclose a feather flap. Atkins teaches that it is old and well known in the woodworking arts to construct a fence having a resilient feather flap (40, 41; fig. 2) so as to efficiently guide and control a workpiece (fig. 1) during operation. Because the references are from a similar art, it would have been obvious to the skilled Artisan at the time of the invention to provide Rice's fence (44, 86) with a resilient feather flap so as to efficiently control a workpiece during operation as taught by Atkins.

Claims 20 and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rice et al. (4,884,604) in view Pontikas (4,809,755) as applied to claims 6 and 11 above, and further in view of Kapton et al. (5,117,880). Rice does not disclose a shield. Kapton teaches in a closely related art that it is old and well known in the mechanical tool arts to construct or use a shield (300) covering a bit hole or in conjunction with a bit hole so as to provide safety from a tool bit during operation. Because the references are from a similar art and deal with a similar problem, i.e., a table mounted tool having a vertical tool/bit; it would have been obvious at the time of the invention to provide Rice with a shield over the bit hole for safety as taught by Kapton.

Claim 29 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rice et al. (4,884,604) in view Pontikas (4,809,755) as applied to claim 6 above, and further in view of Shook (3,905,273). Neither Rice nor Pontikas disclose an exhaust hole. Shook teaches that it is old and well known in the router table art to construct a router table having an exhaust hole (32)

so as to facilitate discharge of debris from the router during operation (fig. 1, 3, 5). Because the references are from a similar art and deal with a similar problem, i.e., reverse mounting or mounting of a router to the underside of a table top; it would have been obvious to the skilled Artisan at the time of the invention to provide Rice with an exhaust hole to provide efficient discharge of debris from a router table during operation as taught by Shook.

Claim 30 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rice et al. (4,884,604) in view Pontikas (4,809,755) as applied to claim 6 above, and further in view of McCambridge et al. (4,350,193). Rice does not explicitly disclose a electrical unit on the legs of the router table. McCambridge teaches that it is old and well known in the workbench art to provide an electrical unit having an on/off switch (14) and outlet (13; fig. 1) supported by the legs (fig. 1) of a workbench as so to provide power to a tool mounted to the table. It would have been obvious at the time of the invention to the skilled Artisan to provide Rice with an electrical unit having an on/off switch and outlet wherein the electrical unit is supported by the legs of a table for electrical power as taught by McCambridge.

Claim 31 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rice et al. (4,884,604) in view Pontikas (4,809,755) as applied to claim 11 above, and further in view of Cowman (4,718,468). Neither Rice nor Pontikas teach the holes to be circular. Cowman teaches in a closely related art, circular mounting holes (34) for mounting a variety of differing tools. Because the references are from a similar art it would have been obvious to the skilled Artisan at the time of the invention to replace either Rice's or Pontikas' elongated holes with circular holes

so as to efficiently mount a tool as taught by Cowman. Furthermore it would have been equally obvious to the skilled Artisan to replace Cowman's circular holes with elongated holes as to mount a tool as taught by either Rice or Pontikas.

### ***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

### ***Conclusion***

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Shelley Self whose telephone number is 571-272-4524. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30 - 5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Derris Banks can be reached on 571-272-4419. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Shelley Self/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3725

SS  
September 4, 2008